

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated January 14, 2009, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As indicated above, claims 1, 8, 13 and 19-21 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability. Claims 4, 11 and 16 have been amended in order to conform to the amendments made to claims 1, 8, and 13. The amendments are unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability and do not narrow the literal scope of the claims.

By editing a track data file and creating new key data for the edited track data file(s) such that re-encryption of the encryption blocks is not performed for the edited track data file(s) as claimed in claims 1, 8, 13 and 19-21, the claimed invention provides an apparatus and method capable of shortening the processing time required when editing is performed. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 8, 13 and 19-21.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 13, 15-16 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Yoshiura, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,720) in view of *Keith* (U.S. Patent No. 5,615,020), and *Park* (U.S. Patent No. 5,761,302).

Yoshiura, et al. appears to disclose improvements in processing efficiency of encryption and cipher strength (Col. 1, lines 5-11).

Thus, *Yoshiura, et al.* only discloses compressing and encrypting data. Nothing in *Yoshiura, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests editing the compressed and encrypted data as claimed in claims 1, 13 and 21. Furthermore, nothing in *Yoshiura, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests creating new key data such that re-encryption of the encryption blocks is not performed for the

edited track data file(s) as claimed in claims 1, 13 and 21. Rather, *Yoshiura, et al.* only discloses compression and encryption of data.

Keith appears to disclose decompression of statistically encoded digital signals using Huffman encoding (Col. 1, lines 6-24).

Thus, *Keith* only discloses Huffman encoding. Nothing in *Keith* shows, teaches or suggests editing a track data file and creating new key data such that re-encryption of the encryption blocks is not performed as claimed in claims 1, 13 and 21. Rather, *Keith* only discloses Huffman encoding.

Park appears to disclose adding a header area to the front of a MPEG bit stream. When encrypting the MPEG bit stream in units of GOP, encryption blocks are classified by the packet start code prefix and stream ID in the PES header (Col. 5, lines 44-57).

Thus, *Park* merely discloses encrypting a bit stream in units of GOP. Nothing in *Park* shows, teaches or suggests editing a track data file and creating new key data such that re-encryption of the encryption block is not performed as claimed in claims 1, 13 and 21. Rather, *Park* only discloses encrypting a bit stream in units of GOP.

Since nothing in *Yoshiura, et al.*, *Keith* or *Park* show, teach or suggest editing a track data file and creating a new key data such that re-encryption of the encryption blocks is not performed as claimed in claims 1, 13, and 21, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1, 13 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 3-4, 6 and 15-16 recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-4, 6 and 15-16 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Yoshiura, et al.*, *Keith* and *Park* at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore,

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 3-4, 6 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 2 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Yoshiura, et al., Park, Keith* and further in view of *Bellovin, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,241,599). Claims 5 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Yoshiura, et al., Park, Keith*, and further in view of *Yuenyongsgool* (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,152).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, since nothing in the combination of *Yoshiura, et al., Park* and *Keith* show, teach or suggest the primary features as claimed in claims 1 and 13, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the primary references with the secondary references to *Bellovin, et al.* and *Yuenyongsgool* will not overcome the deficiencies of the primary references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2, 5, 14 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 8, 10-11, and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Yoshiura, et al.* in view of *Keith* and *Park*, and further in view of *Bahout, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,594,793).

As discussed above, nothing in *Yoshiura, et al., Keith*, or *Park*, taken singularly or in combination, show, teach or suggest editing a track data file and creating new key data such that re-encryption of the encryption blocks is not performed as claimed in claims 18 and 19-20.

Bahout, et al. appears to disclose verifying the compatibility between a manufacturer's password and a key contained in a memory by presenting the manufacturer's encrypted password resulting from the computation (Col. 7, lines 10-17).

Thus, *Bahout, et al.* merely discloses verification of identification. Nothing in *Bahout, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests editing a track file and creating new key data such that re-encryption of the encryption blocks is not performed as claimed in claims 8 and 19-20.

Since nothing in *Yoshiura, et al.*, *Keith, Park* and *Bahout, et al.* show, teach or suggest editing a track data file and creating new key data such that re-encryption of the encryption blocks is not performed as claimed in claims 8 and 19-20, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 8 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 10-11 depend from claim 8 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-11 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Yoshiura, et al.*, *Keith, Park* and *Bahout, et al.*, at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Yoshiura, et al.*, *Park, Keith* and *Bahout, et al.*, and further in view of *Bellovin, et al.* Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Yoshiura, et al.*, *Park, Keith* and *Bahout, et al.* and further in view of *Yuenyongsgool*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, since nothing in the combination of the primary references shows, teaches or suggests the primary features as claimed in claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the primary references with the secondary references to *Bellovin, et al.* or *Yuenyongsgool* will not overcome the deficiencies of the primary references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The prior art of record, which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination do not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: May 13, 2009

By: 

Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
Tel. (202) 292-1530